

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Attached is one Replacement Drawing Sheet including Fig. 2 which should replace the one originally filed drawing sheet including Fig. 2. Fig. 2 is amended to include the erroneously omitted reference number "3".

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and the following remarks.

Fig. 2 is amended to include the erroneously omitted reference number "3". This drawing amendment adds no new matter.

The claims are amended solely for purposes of defining in a different manner that which was originally claimed. Thus, the claim amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. Specifically, Claims 1 and 6 are amended to address the issues raised in paragraph "4" of the Official Action. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is therefore respectfully requested.

Before turning to the prior art, a brief summary of the disclosed device for producing a gas cushion for supporting a preheated glass sheet is provided. The device includes a chamber 7 connected to a source of compressed gas 21. The upper wall 10 of the chamber 7 is adapted in its external dimensions to the outline of the glass sheet and has a plurality of apertures 15 for the passage of the gas. The apertures are designed as nozzles 15 having an entry bore 17 and a progressively widening exit hole 16. As can be seen in Figs. 3 and 4, which each illustrate an embodiment of the upper wall 10, there is a greater degree of perforation (i.e., a greater sum of the nozzle exit areas in relation to the total area of the respective zone) in edge zones (12, 13) of the upper wall 10 than in a central zone 11 of the upper wall 10. The central zone 11 is completely surrounded by the edge zones (12, 13). Examples of unexpected advantages arising from this configuration are discussed in the paragraph starting on line 13 of page 3 of this application.

Claim 1, the only independent claim, is rejected as being anticipated by Japanese Application Publication No. 2000/247663, hereinafter Masuhide.

Claim 1 recites a device for producing a gas cushion for supporting a preheated glass sheet including a chamber connected to a source of compressed gas. The upper wall of the chamber is adapted in its external dimensions to the outline of the glass sheet and has a plurality of apertures for the passage of the gas. The apertures are designed as nozzles having an entry bore and a progressively widening exit hole. The upper wall of the chamber has a greater degree of perforation (a greater sum of the nozzle exit areas in relation to the total area of the respective zone) in edge zones of the upper wall than in a central zone of the upper wall which is completely surrounded by the edge zones.

Discussing Masuhide, the Official Action states that "Figure 13a appears to have more perforation in the edges of the bed than the center of the bed." The Official Action thus appears to take the position that there are more perforations per unit area at the edges of the bed than in the center of the bed. This is not so. A careful study of Masuhide's Fig. 13a makes clear that the perforations are evenly distributed; only the size of the perforations varies.

Moreover, it is not the perforations per unit area that is recited in Claim 1, but the sum of nozzle exit areas in relation to the total area. In this regard, a careful study of Masuhide's Fig. 13a makes clear that, in view of certain of the nozzles 30 in the central zone having larger size exit areas, it is the central zone that has a greater degree of perforation, i.e., a greater sum of nozzle exit areas in relation to the total area of the respective zone, than the edge zones. Claim 1 here recites just the opposite, i.e., that the upper wall of a chamber has a greater degree of perforation (a

greater sum of the nozzle exit areas in relation to the total area of the respective zone) in edge zones than in a central zone.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is allowable over Masuhide, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 s being anticipated by Masuhide is respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in the dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 15, 2008

By: Peter T. DeVore
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32814

Peter T. DeVore
Registration No. 60361

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620